

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ROLAND MA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBIN FRY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. MC21-0015-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a complaint for civil rights violations. (Dkt. No. 21). Under the Court's vexatious litigant order, the Court must screen any complaint that Mr. Ma files in this District before a summons will issue. (Dkt. No. 1.)

Having reviewed the proposed complaint (Dkt. No. 21-1), the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion because the complaint fails to comply with the requirements imposed by the Court's vexatious litigant order (Dkt. No. 1 at 3-4). It fails to explain on a claim-by-claim basis "(a) whether each claim was raised in any prior action (with appropriate citation) and (b) why each claim is not barred by collateral estoppel, *res judicata*, and/or an applicable immunity." (*Id.*) Under the vexatious litigant order, the action shall be dismissed *sua sponte* without further opportunity to respond if the Court determines that good cause has not been shown.¹ (*Id.*)

¹ Even if Mr. Ma had complied with the requirements of this Court's vexatious litigant order, his current complaint appears to raise civil rights claims related to an ongoing criminal matter in

1 Accordingly, Mr. Ma's motion (Dkt. No. 21) is DENIED.

2
3 DATED this 10th day of July 2023.

4
5
6 

7 John C. Coughenour
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 state court. (*See generally* Dkt. No. 21.) The Court must abstain when state proceedings
26 involving important state interests are pending and afford adequate opportunity to raise
constitutional issues. *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43–54 (1971). Therefore, even if Mr. Ma
had followed the pre-filing order, this complaint would be dismissed on abstention grounds.